



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,351	02/24/2004	Elizabeth Kornecki	19658Z	8733

7590 05/15/2007  
Peter I. Bernstein  
Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.  
Suite 300  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, NY 11530

EXAMINER
----------

BRANNOCK, MICHAEL T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1649

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/15/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/785,351	Applicant(s) KORNECKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael Brannock	Art Unit 1649	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-17, 19 and 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 17 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>022404</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of Application: Claims and Amendments***

Applicant's election with traverse of Group V, claims 17 and 18 in the paper received 2/26/2007 is acknowledged. Applicant traverses the restriction requirement on several grounds. First that the grouping are not independent and distinct. This is not found persuasive for the following reasons:

Under MPEP § 803, there are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions:

(A) The inventions must be independent (see MPEP § 8702.01, 806.04, 808.01) or distinct as claimed (see MPEP § 806.05- §806.05(I)); and

(B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP § 803.02, § 806.04(a)- 806.04(I), § 808.01(a), and § 808.02).

Consistent with current patent practice, a serious search burden may be established by

(A) separate classification thereof: (B) a separate status in the art when they are classifiable together: (C) a different field of search. These criteria were met in the above restriction.

Applicant challenges Office policy concerning the reliance on classification, on the burden of additional fees, and potential double patenting issues; however the examiner cannot comment on Office policy. Therefore, the restriction is maintained and made Final.

### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code, see page 39 for example. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a polynucleotide of SEQ ID NO: 1 and 2, encoding a platelet F11 receptor, and for polynucleotides that differ from the polynucleotides of SEQ ID NO: 1 or 2 due to the degeneracy of the genetic code but which encode a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 3 or 4, does not reasonably provide enablement for sequences from other species, mutated sequences, allelic variants, or sequences that have a recited degree of identity. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The claims encompass polynucleotides encoding amino acid sequence variants of the polypeptides of SEQ ID NO: 3 and 4, i.e., those encoding amino acid substitutions, deletions or insertions in a protein corresponding to SEQ ID NO: 3 and 4. The specification has failed to teach one of skill in the art which amino acid substitutions, deletions or insertions to make. Furthermore, the Applicant has not provided guidance as to what properties of the allelic variants or sequence variants of the protein corresponding to SEQ ID NO: 3 or 4 might be desired nor any guidance as to which amino acid substitutions, deletions or insertions to make to achieve any desired property. Applicant has not defined a difference in structure or difference in function between the proteins corresponding to SEQ ID NO: 3 and 4 and variants of said proteins. If a variant of the proteins corresponding to SEQ ID NO: 3 and 4 is to have a structure and function

Art Unit: 1649

similar to the proteins corresponding to SEQ ID NO: 3 and 4, then the specification has failed to teach one of skill in the art which amino acid substitutions, deletions or insertions to make that will preserve the structure and function of the proteins corresponding to SEQ ID NO: 3 and 4.

The problem of predicting protein structure from sequence data and in turn utilizing predicted structural determinations to ascertain functional aspects of the protein is extremely complex. While it is known that many amino acid substitutions are generally possible in any given protein, the positions within the protein's sequence where such amino acid substitutions can be made with a reasonable expectation of success are limited. Certain positions in the sequence are critical to the protein's structure/function relationship, e.g. such as various sites or regions directly involved in binding, activity and in providing the correct three-dimensional spatial orientation of binding and active sites. These regions can tolerate only relatively conservative substitutions or no substitutions (see Bowie et al., 1990, Science 247:1306-1310, especially p.1306, column 2, paragraph 2). Guo-HH et al. PNAS 101(25)9205-9210, 2004, recently reviewed the art and conducted an extensive study on the effect of amino acid substitution on the functionality of a wide variety of proteins and found that on average a single amino acid substitution had a 34% chance inactivating the functionality of the protein, see the Abstract.

However, Applicant has provided little or no guidance beyond the mere presentation of sequence data to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to determine, without undue experimentation, the positions in the protein which are tolerant to change (e.g. such as by amino acid substitutions or deletions), and the nature and extent of changes that can be made in these positions. Also, these or other regions may be critical determinants of antigenicity. It is well

Art Unit: 1649

appreciated in the art of antibody production that it is unpredictable which amino acids are critical antigenic determinants (see Alexander et al., Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 89(3352-3356)1992. Protein antigenicity can be significantly reduced by substitution of even a single residue. Further, even if an amino acid substitution does not destroy the activity of the immunizing protein, the substitution may significantly reduce the antigenicity of the protein (see the Abstract of Alexander et al.). The specification does not provide sufficient guidance as to how to make antibodies that are specific to variants of SEQ ID NO: 3 and 4 that can be used for any specific purpose. The specification has not provided guidance as to natural variants that may exist, nor how to use antibodies specific to variants that might be created.

Although the specification outlines art-recognized procedures for producing and screening for active variants, this is not adequate guidance as to the nature of active variants that may be constructed, but is merely an invitation to the artisan to use the current invention as a starting point for further experimentation. Even if an active or binding site were identified in the specification, they may not be sufficient, as the ordinary artisan would immediately recognize that an active or binding site must assume the proper three-dimensional configuration to be active, which conformation is dependent upon surrounding residues; therefore substitution of non-essential residues can often destroy activity.

Additionally, claim 18 encompasses polynucleotides that would hybridize under low stringency conditions to a polynucleotide encoding an F11 receptor, yet such hybridizing polynucleotides would be expected to encode polypeptides that are unrelated to any F11 receptor, or to not encode any polypeptide at all. Further, such hybridization conditions would

Art Unit: 1649

not permit those polynucleotides to be used as probes because the hybridization would not be specific. The specification has failed to teach how to use such polynucleotides.

Due to the large quantity of experimentation necessary to generate the infinite number of variant recited in the claims and possibly screen same for activity, the lack of direction/guidance presented in the specification regarding which structural features are required in order to provide activity, the absence of working examples directed to same, the complex nature of the invention, the state of the prior art which establishes the unpredictability of the effects of mutation on protein structure and function, and the breadth of the claims which fail to recite any structural or functional limitations, undue experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to make and/or use the claimed invention in its full scope.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification discloses polynucleotides of SEQ ID NO: 1 and 2, yet the claims encompass polynucleotides not described in the specification, e.g., sequences from other species, mutated sequences, allelic variants, genomic sequences, or sequences that have a recited degree of identity. None of these sequences meet the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Although one of skill in the art would reasonably predict that these sequences exist, one would not be able make useful predictions as to the positions or identities of those sequences based on the information disclosed in the specification.

Art Unit: 1649

With the exception of the of the polynucleotides of SEQ ID NO: 1 and 2, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed variants. Therefore, only the polynucleotides of SEQ ID NO: 1 and 2, and polynucleotides *consisting* of fragments thereof, but not the full breadth of the claims meet the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by GenBank accession number AA101561, October 1996. GenBank accession number AA101561 discloses a DNA molecule (oligomer) that is 99.2 % identical to SEQ ID NO: 2 over a region of 377 bases (see sequence alignment provided in parent application 09397243) and would thus hybridize to a polynucleotide of SEQ ID NO: 2 under highly stringent conditions.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re*



Art Unit: 1649

*Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claim 1 of U. S. Patent No. 6699688 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: the instant claims claim a broader genus (e.g. polynucleotides encoding polypeptides that are 90% identical to SEQ ID NO: 3 or 4, and polynucleotides that hybridize to polynucleotides of SEQ ID NO: 1 or 2) than that of U.S. Patent No: 6699688; however, as a species claim (that of U.S. Patent No: 6699688) anticipates that of a genus claim (the instant claims), issuance of the instant claims would result in an improper extension of the "right to exclude" already granted in the 6699688 patent.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Brannock, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0869. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, Ph.D., can be reached at (571) 272-0867. Official papers filed by fax should be directed to **571-273-8300**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

MB



5/11/2007



JANET L. ANDRES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER